

Journal
of the
Child Welfare League
of America
Inc.

child welfare

October 1955

Public Agency Development

Merger of Welfare Agencies

Pros and Cons of Merger

Report on Adoption

work
library
visit,
AV
741
21
18
V.34
W.8
C.2

which
er the
is to

comes
it goes
y with
ning a

AR
Service
, Mo.

children
, New
. New

deal-
rt for
avior
aging

inch;
eration.
lement

family-
quali-
com-
actice.
or fur-
rector,
a, 478
onn.

[26]

CHILD WELFARE JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

CHILD WELFARE is a forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CONTENTS

	Page
A Development in Public Agency Service for Parents	1
By Mary S. Brubaker	
A Merger of Child Welfare Agencies	7
By Clayton E. Nordstrom	
Some Pros and Cons of Merger	11
By Perry B. Hall	
Editorial Comment	
A Sensational Report on Adoption	15
Adoption Placements	
Among Service Personnel	17
News from the Field	19
A Board Member Speaks	20
Book Notes	23
Classified Ad Service	26

Editorial and general office: 345 East 46th Street, N. Y. 17, N. Y. Published monthly except August and September by the Child Welfare League of America, Inc. Annual Subscription, \$3.00; Single Copies, 35 cents.

VOL. XXXIV

No. 7

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Officers

MARSHALL FIELD, President, New York
MRS. HERIBERT F. FISHER, Vice-Pres., Hartford, Conn.
MRS. JOE HUME GARDNER, Vice-Pres., Conde, Va.
MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER, Vice-Pres., New York
MRS. GEORGE L. WEST, Vice-Pres., Pittsburgh, Pa.
MRS. RAY W. WILCOX, Vice-Pres., San Angelo, Texas
MISS LOIS WHEDDY, Secretary, Chicago, Ill.
THOMAS M. PETERS, Treasurer, New York
JOSEPH H. REID, Executive Dir.
HELEN R. HAGAN, Asst. Exec. Dir.

Board of Directors

DR. LEONA BALMIGARTNER, New York, N. Y.
FRANK S. BAXLEY, Jr., Seattle, Wash.
MRS. RICHARD J. BERNHARD, New York, N. Y.
JUDGE JANE M. BOHN, New York, N. Y.
JAMES BROWN, IV, Chicago, Ill.
MRS. ROBERT A. BROWN, Des Moines, Iowa
MRS. SARA R. CALDWELL, Jackson, Miss.
MRS. CLARENCE A. CHESTER, Piedmont, Cal.
DR. ALLEN DAVIS, Chicago, Ill.
MRS. IRVING EDISON, St. Louis, Mo.
JUDGE GEORGE EDWARDS, Detroit, Mich.
DR. MARTHA M. ELIOT, Washington, D. C.
ALAN S. GLISMER, Cleveland, Ohio
CLYDE GLITZ, Los Angeles, Cal.
AUSTIN T. GRAVES, Darien, Conn.
JOSEPH E. HANS, Atlanta, Ga.
SHELBY M. HARRISON, New York, N. Y.
MRS. KATE B. HELMS, Columbia, S. C.
LISLE L. JACOBS, Dallas, Texas
JUDGE HARRY W. LINDEMAN, Newark, N. J.
LEONARD W. MAYO, New York, N. Y.
ROBERT M. MILFORD, Boston, Mass.
GEORGE M. NAVAR, Boston, Mass.
JACK N. PFEIFFER, Chicago, Ill.
DR. JULIA B. RICHMOND, Syracuse, N. Y.
JULIA F. ROTTMAN, New York, N. Y.
WILLIAM D. SCHMIDT, Cleveland, Ohio
MRS. J. FRAZER SMITH, Memphis, Tenn.
DR. THOMAS M. SUGG, Northfield, Minn.
REV. JOSEPH P. SPRINGER, Milwaukee, Wis.
JOHN G. THIEBAN, Washington, D. C.
MRS. JEAN T. TRIPPE, New York, N. Y.
C. ROLLIN ZANE, Hartford, Conn.

COMMITTEES ON PUBLICATIONS AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

E. MARGUERITE GARY, Chairman
Executive Director, *Children's Aid and S.P.C.A.*, Buffalo, N. Y.

Policy Committee

MRS. CHARLES S. MONROE
MRS. RANDOLPH GUGGENHEIMER
MR. C. ROLLIN ZANE

Advisory Committee

VIRGINIA BEUSER
Executive Director, National Publicity Council, New York, N. Y.
GORDON BERG
Community Chests and Councils, New York, N. Y.
MRS. CLEVELAND B. CHASE
Board Member, St. Christopher's School, Dabbs Ferry, N. Y.
THELMA K. FLOWER
Executive Director
Family Service Society, Akron, Ohio
DOROTHY HUTCHINSON
Professor of Social Work
New York School of Social Work, New York, N. Y.
ADELAIDE K. KISER
Director, Hillside Children's Center, Rochester, N. Y.
FRIEDA M. KUEHMANN
Executive Secretary
First Family Day Care Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
LUCILLE LEWIS
Day Care Consultant
State Department of Welfare, Nashville, Tenn.
ROBERT F. OTT
Director, Division of Child Guardianship, State Department
of Welfare, Boston, Mass.
SUSANNE SCHLUZ
Associate Professor, School of Social Service Administration,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
VERNE WEED
Assistant Executive Director
Children's Service of Conn., Hartford, Conn.
RUTH WEISENBARGER
Assistant Director
Sheltering Arms Childrens Service, New York, N. Y.

A DEVELOP

Mary S.

Supervisor
Department
Philadelphia

The child c
is one of m
day brings in
ship between
voluntary ch
similar mann
of Public We
sponsibility t
working tog
roles, recogni
are essential.

We have b
claim we ha
pattern in ou
in the fact
Court and t
resisting cha
ward definit
versal—com
challenge of

It is then
describes a
community.
ence as a sh
development i
intention to
was able to
ended desp
structure.

Depu

APRIL 1
child we
The Pres
John A.

On and a
duties and
support an
children th
City (form
and perfor
Welfare of

Some 5,
half as m

CHILD

A DEVELOPMENT IN PUBLIC AGENCY SERVICE FOR PARENTS

Mary S. Brubaker

Supervisor

Department of Public Welfare
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The winner of the 1955 Mary E. Boretz Second Award is a success story. It tells of a city's ouster of an outmoded system of dealing with parents and children in trouble and the challenge to child welfare workers in developing practices in line with current concepts of helping people.

The child care picture in the Philadelphia community is one of movement, change and improvement. Each day brings increasing clarity and trust in the relationship between the Department of Public Welfare and the voluntary child-placing agencies and institutions. In a similar manner the Juvenile Court and the Department of Public Welfare, as the agencies carrying public responsibility for dependent and neglected children, are working together on the delineation of their respective roles, recognizing that some basic changes in structure are essential.

We have by no means reached the place where we can claim we have solved the problems in the child care pattern in our community. However, our great hope lies in the fact that the voluntary agencies, the Juvenile Court and the Department of Public Welfare are not resisting change but accepting it and are working toward definite objectives. The stirrings are almost universal—complacency has given way to inquiry. The challenge of self-study and change is the order of the day.

It is then against this back-drop that Miss Brubaker describes a function new for the public agency in our community. Her purpose is not to hold up this experience as a shining example of a new and profound development in the field of child welfare. It is rather her intention to show how a service-minded public agency was able to develop a new function professionally oriented despite an outmoded community child care structure.

MANUEL KAUFMAN,

Deputy Commissioner of Social Services, Phila.
Department of Public Welfare.

APRIL 17, 1953, was a red letter day for child welfare in the City of Philadelphia. The President Judge of the Municipal Court, John A. Boyle, read the decision:

On and after September 1, 1953, all powers, functions, duties and obligations, in any manner concerning the support and maintenance generally of any child or children then being exercised and performed by the City (former County) Commissioners shall be exercised and performed exclusively by the Department of Public Welfare of the City of Philadelphia.

Some 5,209 children were involved; about half as many parents would be affected. Foster

home agencies and institutions for placement of dependent children were watching us as well as other City employees and persons of political influence. Social workers were about to take on a job formerly performed by politically appointed investigators and collectors.

Prior to this decision, more than half the children committed by court for placement had been committed directly to private child-caring agencies. Once the commitment was made, the City paid an established rate to the placement agency. No City agency took any real interest or made any investigation concerning the kind of care provided or how long this care extended.

After September 1, 1953, these commitments were all changed so that the child was committed to the custody of the Department of Public Welfare for a given agency. The Department of Public Welfare was also charged to "from time to time investigate the manner in which [the children] are being cared for."

Formerly, a parent's responsibility to contribute financially toward the cost of his child's care was defined by the court in the form of an order, i.e., a parent may have been ordered by court to pay so much per week to reimburse the City for the cost of the care provided for his child. This money was "collected" by City Commissioners—this was their only function. If an account became in arrears, the parent was in contempt of court and could be sentenced to a prison term. Now the Department of Public Welfare was to do this job. We knew that a parent's financial responsibility to his child could not be separated from other placement problems and believed that with this awareness we could

help parents make sound plans for payment of court orders. We had the additional purpose of calling to the attention of the court those parents whose ability to pay the order had changed and whose order needed review. Those parents who seemed able to pay but who did not pay were to be referred to the Department of Collections for "enforcement of the court order."

The Background

Philadelphia, the third largest city in the country, with several good schools of social work in and near the city, the home of some of the most advanced thinking in the field of social and child welfare, is nevertheless a city of paradoxes when one reviews the placement picture. Before January 7, 1952, when for the first time in half a century there was a political change in City government, the Department of Public Welfare, with an estimated caseload of 5,000 dependent and handicapped children, had a staff of one supervisor and nine workers. In 1952 with the appointment of a new Commissioner of Welfare and several top-notch persons in the field of child welfare, the Department began a long and difficult period of readjustment, studies, recruitment and employment of qualified supervisors and caseworkers, and development of a philosophy more consistent with the advanced knowledge and practices in child welfare. This paved the way to begin planning for the more than 5,000 dependent children who were still placed and cared for without any participation of Department although legally these children were our responsibility.*

The Commissioner of Welfare, in his petition to the Municipal Court which requested that functions carried by the City Commissioners be transferred to DPW, testified:

I think the biggest protection and the biggest saving to this community will be in terms of reuniting families,

* Dependent children were made the responsibility of the Department of Public Welfare through the State County Institution District Act of 1937 and again through the City Home Rule Charter adopted April 17, 1951. Functions relating to these children had been carried by Children's Agents of the County Commissioners.

getting children back into the family setting or having those suitable for adoption placed in an adoption setting as expeditiously as possible. Secondly, this casework relationship with the family will not permit a financial delinquency to mount to a sizable proportion.

It was in response to this petition that Judge Boyle issued the order transferring functions from the City Commissioners to the Department of Public Welfare.

This stated intention to initiate and administer a program designed to give own parents a place in planning for children in placement, to work toward discharge to own families wherever possible, to offer adoption when feasible to children whose parents cannot or will not carry a continued relationship with them, seems fundamental. Yet it is just this beginning philosophy which met much resistance in the community.

The numbers of children in care in Philadelphia were greater in proportion to the population than in any city of similar size. To do something about this means work and expense—a search for lost parents, finding and developing suitable adoptive homes.

First Steps

It was not an easy beginning. In the first place we had to acquire additional space for expansion and were thereby separated from the rest of our agency by seven city blocks. We were all new to Department of Public Welfare—two supervisors, eighteen social workers, one clerk typist and four stenographers. Beginning with some old dilapidated office equipment, no records and no master file, we suddenly became responsible for some 3,000 families. It was weeks before we knew how to find what records our predecessors had kept. It was at least half a year before we could determine with any degree of validity how much a parent was paying on his order. It was ten months before a court session was held to review orders on parents. We were bogged down on every side with administrative problems, while we coped with the primary job of trying to define, redefine and refine a philosophy of helping which would be consistent with the best interests

having
setting
work re-
nancial

Judge
ctions
depart-

d ad-
own
ren in
ge to
offer
whose
inued
ental.
which

Phila-
to the
size.
k and
nding
es.

the first
ce for
from
locks.
public
social
enough
dated
master
we
predi-
year
ree of
ng on
court
rents.
h ad-
with
define
which
erests

of the taxpayers, the child in care, his family and the many placement agencies.

Since the Juvenile Court receives applications for placement and determines which agency shall place a child, the Department does not become active until the time of commitment. Then each parent is interviewed immediately after the court hearing in order to establish the basis for continuing relationship with regard to parental responsibility, financial and otherwise, for the child in care. At first we involved ourselves mainly with questions about the parent's financial ability to contribute to the cost of care and his emotional problems relating to his desire or resistance toward taking this responsibility. We measured a parent's resources and obligations against the support order and tried to help him make a plan for payment or to request court to review the amount of the order. Within a short time the initial interview included other questions:

How did the parent feel about the court action? Did he want placement for his child or was he forced into it by circumstances? Was it an authoritative decision of the court based on neglect or some other complaint against the parent? Did he know where his child was to be placed? Had he talked with someone from the placement agency? Did he know how to arrange a visit? What plan was he considering for his child?

These questions reaped a rich reward. Many children are still accepted by agencies for placement without any contact between agency and the child's parent. If the family is ever to be re-united, it seemed important to us to work on this at the point of the separation of parent and child. Yet many parents come to us not knowing where their child will be, whether they can ever visit, whether they can ever reestablish a home for the child.

Locating "Lost" Parents

During our first year of operation, our staff was continuously involved in the search for information about the thousands of children already in care in agencies but not committed to us. Many of their parents had disappeared over the years; some have now been located.

First we concentrated mainly on those who had reimburse orders on which pay-

ments were not current. We knew vaguely that what we wanted to do was to determine the extent of a person's ability to pay. If he could pay the order and arrears, we would try to help him make realistic plans to do so. If there were good cause for inability to pay, we would ask the court to review his order to place it within his ability. If he did not meet our expectations or if we could not locate him, we referred his account to the Department of Collections for attachment proceedings or for adjustment.

Some of our earliest efforts were directed toward the accounts with largest arrearages. Most of these were orders on fathers who had disappeared. Some whom we located gave us a surprising welcome:

¶ Mr. Kelly owed over \$5,000 and had not visited his children since their placement shortly after his wife's death. He was located by way of a previous employer and his social security number. Upon receipt of our letter he appeared at the desk of our surprised social worker saying, "I've come to give myself up. I'm tired of running away." He fully expected to be imprisoned that morning but something in our letter, written with sympathy and understanding, had prompted him to try to "do the right thing."

¶ Mr. Turner, who owed over \$6,000 and who was located with much difficulty, also had not visited his children. He told our worker he had "gone to pot" after his wife's desertion, had traveled around, become alcoholic, felt he was a bum and though he had later settled down and was working, he did not feel worthy of letting his children see him in his run-down state. After some sensitive help from his caseworker, he was able to bring himself to visit his children. He has since paid something for their care for the first time since their placement, six years previously.

With men like Mr. Turner with little personality strength, we explored their current ability to contribute financially, while trying to help them get to the placement agency to renew contact with their children. When they showed they were trying to meet their responsibilities, we made a referral to court for readjustment of the arrears on the support orders.

Helping Parent Develop Own Resources

We were also meeting problems with clients who showed us that they were unable to pay the amount of support ordered by

court because of employment problems. Before requesting a review of the order for the unemployed parent, we ask why he was unemployed, why he could not find employment, what his earning potential was. We ask for verification of his attempts to find employment and for other evidences of his efforts to fulfill parental responsibility. How is his child getting along? When did he last visit? What is his long-range plan for the child?

Perhaps our most outstanding success in this area has been the handful of people who have found their way to medical facilities and have removed or overcome medical obstacles to employment:

¶ Mr. Davis, who was quite deaf, came to us asking for relief from his court order because he could not find work. Our worker suggested the Bureau of Rehabilitation connected with the State Employment Service. Mr. Davis gratefully accepted the referral, was given a hearing aid, and subsequently was employed as a cab driver. He was then able to begin payment of his court order.

¶ Mr. and Mrs. Norton were interviewed at the time their child was committed. An order had been placed on both parents. Later Mrs. Norton notified us by telephone that Mr. Norton had lost his job, but they did not keep the appointment offered to them. After several months of non-payment of the order we considered referral to the Department of Collections. Upon careful reading of the intake interview we noted the observation that "Mr. Norton seemed to be puzzled by something or to be trying very hard to understand what I said." On the hunch that something was wrong our worker contacted them.

Several days later Mrs. Norton appeared at the office. Mr. Norton had not been working and her small earnings constituted the only support for the family including two adults and one adolescent boy. As she sensed the worker's interest and desire to help, she confided that several years ago Mr. Norton had been hospitalized for a neuropsychiatric condition and she feared he was again becoming ill. We refrained from the referral to court to review the order but first required that Mrs. Norton ask Mr. Norton to come for an appointment to discuss his problem.

At the next appointment we learned that Mr. Norton was not only "nervous" but also hard of hearing and suffering from a hernia. He seemed eager to accept the worker's suggested referral to the hospital clinic he had previously attended. He has since kept an appointment there for examination, has had an operation for correction of the hernia and is to be under treatment for his neuropsychiatric condition. Since he had fulfilled ex-

pectations that he try to rehabilitate himself, we then felt we could, in good conscience, request the court to review the court order and consider waiver of the arrears which had developed.

¶ Mr. and Mrs. Grant appeared in our office one day to tell us that they were unable to pay their order because of unemployment. It was evident to our worker that Mrs. Grant was mentally ill and Mr. Grant extremely upset. Upon exploration it developed that Mrs. Grant had suffered a "nervous breakdown" several months previously. She was "lonesome" and Mr. Grant had stayed home from work to "watch her." He had lost his job; they had to sell their furniture and they had been evicted that day. Mr. Grant cried, said he did not know what he was going to do. He had made application for public assistance but could not be accepted without a home address. Neither Mr. nor Mrs. Grant felt that Mrs. Grant needed medical treatment.

It was obvious that the court order was not the most pressing problem they faced. After several interviews and within several months Mr. Grant obtained a job paying about \$51.00 a week and again found an independent home for himself and his wife. He immediately began paying on his court order and has continued faithfully since then. The Grants have since come to us to discuss problems of making arrangements to visit their children. They are not ready to think of taking the children home and it seems doubtful whether treatment for Mrs. Grant would be acceptable to the Grants or even very effective. But with some well-directed help they have been able to maintain themselves and contribute something for their children both financially and by their sustained relationship with them.

The principle that a client use agency service to develop his own resources constructively is one of the best known dynamics of social casework. Nevertheless, it was not applied in Philadelphia in connection with collecting court orders. Private placement agencies have been able to accomplish much in their work with parents of children in care but only a public agency can say to the parent who does not wish to involve himself, "If you do not do what you can, you have the court to contend with." Previously an unpaid court order was allowed to accumulate, or threats to the parent brought payment which may have been unwillingly given at the expense of the family's welfare. No effort was made to help the family become more independent so that it would have more to offer to the child. Or the parent was arrested. Now we offer a service which uses known methods of helping people in trouble

and which
nection wi
care.

Renewed

We have
renewed p
result of ou

Mrs. Smith
our letter inq
order. She w
could not pay
had several
husband's in
order or the c
she requested
ensued. Alth
wished to d
the impossib
them it cou
to go throu
home." It se
cepted our
agency to d

We later
Mrs. Smith
hoping to d
Mrs. Smith
seemed mos
child. We w
seemed to b
pressure of
could hardl

Since th
justify a re
called Mrs.
would wan
order in th
grateful fo
submitted

We fe
specific s
negative
Smith ha
order. Si
the plac
sions, th
left ther
other re

With
agency
establis
that the
with the

and which sees the family's problems in connection with the problems of the child in care.

Renewed Parent-Child Contacts

We have seen many dramatic examples of renewed parent-child contact as a direct result of our activity.

Mrs. Smith came for an appointment in response to our letter inquiring about her non-payment of her court order. She was upset, belligerent and distrusting. She could not pay the order because she had been remarried, had several children by her present husband, and her husband's income was not sufficient to pay the current order or the arrears which had accumulated. Every time she requested money to send to court a family argument ensued. Although our worker tried to explain that we wished to determine what was possible, not to collect the impossible, and that if the order were too high for them it could be reviewed, Mrs. Smith said "If I have to go through this it would be cheaper to take Dotty home." It seemed she really meant this because she accepted our suggestion that she go to the placement agency to discuss discharge.

We later learned from the placement agency that Mrs. Smith had made her request there, but they were hoping to delay any definite action pending exploration. Mrs. Smith had not visited Dotty in some time and it seemed most important that the family get to know the child. We were concerned that Mrs. Smith's motivation seemed to be based on finding a way out of the financial pressure of the court order. We felt such a discharge could hardly be helpful for the child.

Since there was sufficient financial information to justify a referral to court for review of order we again called Mrs. Smith in to discuss whether she felt she would want us to petition the court to reconsider her order in the light of her present obligations. She was grateful for this specific offer of service and we quickly submitted our petition.

We felt we were not only performing our specific service, but hoped also to remove the negative projection both Mr. and Mrs. Smith had put on the expense of the court order. Since they were already involved with the placement agency on discharge discussions, the prospect of removal of court order left them free to explore whether there were other reasons for wanting Dotty home.

With skilled help from the placement agency they planned visits with Dotty to re-establish a relationship with her, and decided that they really wanted her to come home with them when she was ready for this change.

That this would be another mouth to feed was something they decided could be handled by them.

It seemed to us that our sensitivity to the problems of Mr. and Mrs. Smith as they related to the court order and as they affected their feelings and plans for Dotty supported the placement agency's work with these parents. The results could not have been so effective without the combination of efforts of the Public Agency and the private placement agency. As a result, Dotty later was discharged to her family and the arrears on the court order were waived by the court.

Miss Force placed her illegitimate son Billy, when he was three years old. When we reviewed the record he was 13 and we found that Miss Force had not paid her court order for years. She was hundreds of dollars in arrears. The placement agency informed us that although she had visited for a while, it had been several years since she had made any contact with them. Billy had from time to time asked about his mother. Although he was fairly well settled in his foster home, the lack of interest from his mother was upsetting to him.

We made several attempts to reach Miss Force but when she did not reply to our letters, we referred her account to the Department of Collections. She appeared in their office in response to their letter and when she presented a picture of great financial difficulty she was referred to us for further exploration.

Miss Force, now in her forties and still unmarried, wept throughout her entire interview. She had been ill and unable to carry a steady job. She had undergone a thyroid operation. She was having difficulty with menopause and "nerves." She had very little money, no family and was barely able to maintain herself on a part-time job. She felt guilty for not having paid her order, for having had an illegitimate child and for not having kept in touch with him. She didn't know whether she wanted to visit him, whether she wanted to permit his adoption, whether she wanted to go to the placement agency to ask about him or whether she could do anything at all.

Our worker was aware that this mother could not pay a weekly \$7 order and that we could petition the court in her behalf. However, we decided to delay this activity long enough to see if we could help her with some of the other problems related to the child and his placement. The worker was sympathetic and tried to allay some of the worst of Miss Force's anxiety but asked whether she would at least consider an interview at the placement agency.

Miss Force finally conceded, "if they want to see me, I'll go." When we called the placement agency, their worker was very pleased to learn that we had established contact with Miss Force and said that she would be glad to talk with her. We wrote to Miss Force and the placement worker also wrote offering an appointment.

We were in close contact with the placement worker and learned that at the interview Miss Force cried and presented the same conflicts she had expressed to us. But with concrete news of Billy and help with her own conflict about him she calmed greatly and was able to consider a visit with him. Later, Miss Force and Billy had a successful visit and were planning another in the near future.

Now that Miss Force had reestablished contact with the placement agency and with the child we felt that we could proceed to examine the financial problem in more detail.

At her next appointment with us, Miss Force was much more composed than before. She spoke happily of her visit with Billy but was worrying about what she would say if he asked about his father. Our worker was again sympathetic and encouraged Miss Force to go over this with the placement worker who knew Billy and might be able to help her decide what she could do with such a question.

Miss Force was conflicted but also relieved about the possibility of having her order reviewed. She felt she could and wanted to pay something. She verified her income and some of her expenses and we filed our petition. When Court reviewed the case, our recommendations were accepted. The order was reduced and the arrears waived.

Parents have deep conflicts about the child in placement. Sometimes these are so great that the parent cannot face the problem and even the most skilled and best intentioned effort of the placement worker will fail to bring him in for discussion. We are finding that the parent sometimes can more easily respond to our overtures. The fact that failure to "cooperate" with us can place him in contempt of court is important. But it seems equally significant that we are one step further removed from the child, who is the source of the parent's conflict. Thus it may be easier for him to talk to us about money than for him to go to the placement agency to talk about the child. Once we have seen the parent and had some opportunity to explore his problem, to talk about money as it relates to his feeling about the child and his support, we can often provide the bridge to the placement agency and enable him to take the next step in assuming his responsibility to the child. We believe this is why

Miss Force could not go directly to the placement agency, could not even come directly to us, but did respond to the threatening letter from the Department of Collections. Once there, she could come to us. And once she came to our Department she could go to the placement agency and from there get to her child.

Children Relinquished for Adoption

We have had similar experiences with parents who really wish to be freed of parental responsibility and for whom adoption might be an answer.

Mrs. Carter gave birth to Bobby while she was separated from her husband. She placed Bobby shortly after his birth and at the time we first reviewed the case Bobby was four years old and Mrs. Carter's court order was over \$300 in arrears. Mrs. Carter responded to our letter and made an appointment to discuss her court order.

She said she had not been able to pay the order because she was frequently ill, changed jobs because of time lost due to fatigue and colds. She said she did not want to give us the impression that she did not want to help, but she saw nothing in the future for Bobby or herself. At first she thought she would re-marry and take Bobby with her but this did not come about. She feels she could never earn enough money to support Bobby and perhaps if Bobby were adopted it would be better for both of them. He might find a good home and she would not feel so helpless if she did not have the court order over her head continuously.

Our worker explored this with her further, learned that she had not discussed plans with the placement agency and no one from that agency had made any attempt to see her since Bobby's placement four years previously. We referred Mrs. Carter to the placement agency, sent them a report of our activity and requested them to explore the possibility of adoption with Mrs. Carter. Within six months we learned that Mrs. Carter had signed adoption relinquishment and Bobby was placed in an adoptive home.

Thus we had prevented this four-year old child from spending his life in an institution for lack of anyone who was interested enough to talk with his own mother about what she wanted for him. Now he has a family he can call his own.

Continuing Evaluation and Development

These cases are multiplied many times. There are parents who can take and want their children with them but who do not have enough initiative to take any action by themselves. There are parents who really want adoption for their children but who have too much conflict to do anything about

it without decision or
a child in
through vi
they are "i
less some
portance t
who can us
emotional
sponsible p
ing up in i
untold cos
cost to the
years rece
been availa
effort to tr

Our act
duced nu
the numbe
This mean
ceive more
year of ou
to own fa
reduced th
several hu
the previou

A M E

Clayto
Executive
Children's
Oakland, C

HISTORIC
private fo
Oakland :
However,
tions, W
Home, an
about th
study of
sions for

* "A Me
Ackerson;
Howard Hu

CHILD

it without some outside pressure to make a decision or any help in making such a decision. There are parents who can help support a child in placement both financially and through visiting and planning who believe they are "not wanted" or "not worthy" unless someone helps them know their importance to their child. There are parents who can use help in overcoming physical and emotional handicaps and thus be more responsible parents. There are children growing up in institutions and foster homes at an untold cost to the city. But worst of all is the cost to the child who has spent his growing years receiving less than what might have been available to him had someone taken the effort to try to find something better for him.

Our activity is already reflected in a reduced number of children in care although the numbers of commitments are increasing. This means that while we continue to receive more children for care, in less than one year of our service the increase in discharges to own families and through adoptions has reduced the total number of children in care several hundreds below the number in care the previous year.

Although we are greatly excited by what we have done and what we are doing, there is still an unlimited challenge for the future. It is not enough for us to "stimulate" activity in the community. It is not enough that we are instrumental in engaging numbers of parents in planning for their children. It is not enough that discharges are increasing. This is dynamic and moving in comparison to the previous stagnation in public agency concern for children in care in this city. But it is not enough.

There are still vast areas of confusion in our service to parents and children. Our structures and relationships with other public and private agencies demand continuing evaluation and development. But we are moving and others concerned with developing a sound program for children are moving with us. It is through this mutual concern and effort that we hope to achieve a program in which placement will not mean the long-term loss of normal family living for thousands of children, but will rather be a positive force in helping child and parent find a new and sound relationship to each other.

A MERGER OF CHILD WELFARE AGENCIES

Clayton E. Nordstrom
Executive Director
Children's Foster Care Services
Oakland, California

In many communities, the need for a multiple-service agency to provide more adequate foster services for children is the urgent problem. In this third article in a series on Mergers the author shows how several such units effected merger to improve service.*

HISTORICALLY, the need for an adequate private foster care program for children in Oakland might be traced back many years. However, it was in 1944 that three institutions, West Oakland Home, de Fremery Home, and Girls' Agency, raised questions about their programs which resulted in a study of existing agencies and their provisions for caring for those children needing

care outside their own homes. This study was carried out by the agencies with the help of the staff of the Family and Children's Division of the Council of Social Agencies and a professional consultant. It was hoped that out of this study the unmet needs of the community could be more clearly defined and responsibility allocated for meeting those needs. At the time of the study the institutions did their own intake, had extremely limited casework services, and had no provisions for after-care services, especially if a child needed a foster home.

* "A Merger and What Has Happened," Newell W. Ackerson; and "A Merger and How It Happened," Howard Hush; CHILD WELFARE, July 1955, pp. 1-14.

Federation Proved Unworkable

As a result of the study, in 1945 a new agency—"Children's Agency"—was formed with a federated-type of organization consisting of representatives from boards of the several institutions and members chosen from the community-at-large. The function of Children's Agency as established was to provide casework consultation to parents considering substitute parental care for their children, supervised foster home care, and casework services to the clients of the three institutions. The agency was also responsible for processing all applications for institutional care although the institutions had final responsibility for actual admissions.

Structurally, Children's Agency had an autonomous Board of Directors with two representatives from each of the institutional boards, and an administration which had control over its own staff but no direct administrative relationships with the staffs of the institutions. For various reasons, this agency did not meet the needs for casework services to parents and children in institutional care which had been envisioned in the study and plan. Soon the institutions withdrew one by one from the relationship with Children's Agency which continued with a supervised foster home program.

The reasons for the failure of the plan to have one independent agency provide casework services to three other independent agencies seem to be two-fold: (1) Basic differences in the philosophies and concepts of out-of-home care which existed between Children's Agency and the institutions made it unsatisfactory to the institutions for Children's Agency to control intake and provide casework services for them. The Study which had suggested the creation of Children's Agency had also stated in its report:

You cannot divide responsibility of a child and his family between two agencies and at the same time further your eventual purpose—a better relationship between the child and his family, even though you may arrive at that goal in stages such as the care of a child outside of his own home.

(2) The structure of the Board of Directors was unsound. The nucleus of the Board was made up of members chosen from the community-at-large with the remainder being "representatives" from the three institutional Boards. It is almost impossible for "representatives" to a Board to feel that they are full-fledged members of that Board because their activities and feelings must be colored by loyalties to their own agencies. These "representatives" did feel greater loyalty to their own agencies and were not free to work for and to build up this new agency which seemed to threaten the actual existence of their own institutions.

Merger Met Community Need

With the failure of the plan to have centralized intake and casework services for the child welfare agencies, Oakland was left with an established foster home program in Children's Agency and the three nonsectarian institutions without casework services. In 1949, the Children's Agency still felt a strong need for a more adequate foster care program in the community and approached the West Oakland Home—which then operated under the name of the Lincoln Home for Children—and the de Fremery Home for Children with a plan for merging the three agencies under one Board and one administration. The Girls' Agency, which had merged with Children's Agency in 1945, had since closed its doors. The two institutions quickly agreed to enter into discussions of the plan as they saw an opportunity to secure much-needed casework services for their clients. A Merger Committee met almost weekly for a year, at the end of which time the de Fremery Home withdrew from the discussions feeling that it wished to continue operating a program of its own. With the encouragement of the Child Welfare League of America, Inc., Children's Agency and the West Oakland Home continued with discussions of merging the two agencies.

The discussions led to the merger of the two programs under one Board and administration in October, 1950. The new agency was named appropriately, "Children's

Foster Care" to provide supervised treatment for children. A year later Children's Guidance de Fremery Care Service of community that the resources adequately merged again.

There were multiple-service land as its needs were

1. The new one type its own point a for a d
2. The new enough techniques the ch a wor muniti explor
3. The new could h with h could needs ards fo

Childre of its foun the diffic toward n gun to m establishe

New Co Many land five

* Children's Agency name for the Children's Agency Corporation which closed in 1945 but retains its office in the Lincoln Building.

Foster Care Services,"* and was established to provide casework consultation to parents, supervised foster home care, and residential treatment for emotionally disturbed children. A year later, in October, 1951, Children's Guild Board (which operated the de Fremery Home) joined Children's Foster Care Services after making a continued study of community needs and after determining that the resources of their agency could more adequately serve the community through the merged agency.

There was real background of need for the multiple-service, foster care agency in Oakland as it resulted from the merger. Those needs were, primarily, three-fold:

1. The need for an opportunity to offer more than one type of foster care by a single agency within its own program at the point of intake and at the point after placement where a child's needs may be for a different type of foster care.
2. The need for an agency which could be flexible enough to allow experimentation with new techniques and types of foster care. In order to meet the changing needs of children and their parents in a world of ever-changing conditions, the community needed at least one agency that was free to explore new ways of meeting those needs.
3. The need for a private, non-sectarian agency which could take leadership in establishing a program with high casework standards, the results of which could be used to interpret to the community the needs of children and their parents and the standards for fulfilling them.

Children's Foster Care Services at the end of its fourth year can now look back through the difficult struggles of its birth and growth toward maturity and feel that it has truly begun to meet the needs for which it was established.

New Concepts Encouraged Change

Many private agencies, like those in Oakland five years ago, are concerned with

* Children's Foster Care Services is the operating name for the West Oakland Home Corporation. Children's Agency Corporation and Children's Guild Corporation were dissolved. The de Fremery Home was closed in 1950. Children's Foster Care Services maintains its offices and residential treatment program at the Lincoln Home.

changing needs in their communities and are asking these questions:

Do we serve a true need of parents and children in our community when more than one agency must deal with one family group?

Should we change our services to meet our new concepts of service?

Should we close our doors or merge with other agencies in order to provide more adequate facilities and support for one child welfare agency offering one or more of the needed services?

These and other questions of concern to private agencies have been brought about largely by increases in public welfare programs to keep children in their own homes. Also, both public and private programs for foster home care and day care have expanded along with newer understanding and increased skills with the result that fewer children are being placed in institutions for dependency reasons alone. Bowlby's findings that "It is essential for mental health that the infant and young child should experience a warm, intimate, and continuous relationship with his mother (or mother-substitute), in which both find satisfaction and enjoyment"** gives strong support to recent trends in providing foster home care instead of institutional care for children under six years of age when such children must live away from their own parents.

Bringing casework and an institutional program into one administrative unit in Oakland facilitated implementation of the new approach to child welfare. Lincoln Home had children under its care requiring specialized services which its staff could not provide. It wished to develop a high quality treatment home but did not have sufficient funds for this purpose. Children's Agency had a foster home program but was not giving the casework services to the institutions for which it was established. De Fremery Home was offering a temporary care program with particular attention being given to the child needing study in an institutional setting before permanent placement plans could be made, but was trying to do this without

** John Bowlby, M.A., M.D., "Maternal Care and Mental Health," World Health Organization, 1951, p. 11.

adequate staff. The merger established a multiple-service agency which could provide more adequate foster home care and institutional treatment services for children.

Important Considerations in Planning a Merger

The merger of the two Oakland agencies as a solution to meeting the needs of their community for particular services in child welfare came only after those concerned had studied and deliberated over their common problems for a considerable period of time. During these deliberations several important points to be considered in planning the merger were brought out:

To Close an Agency's Door Is Difficult. A very difficult solution to an agency's dilemma of having an outmoded or inadequate program is to close its doors, even though this step may be part of a merger plan. This decision requires an intelligent acceptance of the agency's position after a careful study has been made to determine all the facts. While this may be the best solution in some cases, it is one which may lose for the community both financial and volunteer support for child welfare unless every effort is made to channel these resources into other programs for children.

Mergers Do Not Cost Less. One of the results of a merger is not a lesser expenditure than the total spent by the separate agencies, but there can be a real saving in terms of more adequate services to children and their parents. New or expanded casework services may save the community money in terms of preventive mental health, or through helping parents to keep their children at home, to accept supervised foster home care, or to use institutional care and treatment on a diagnostic basis.

Agencies meeting different needs in the community may find that merger will provide more efficient administration of services to the community. For agencies with obsolete programs or those providing inadequate services, merger may substantially improve the quality of service and allow better use of funds. Thriving, up-to-date

programs can often benefit from the single administrative unit.

Merging of Agencies Is a Difficult Process. From many standpoints, the decision to merge two or more community child welfare agencies may be the most difficult solution to the problem of inadequate services. It can involve the need for still more money than the combined resources would provide; strong threats to the security of staffs, executives, and boards; and the touchy process of solving the personal differences between the members of the various agencies concerned.

There is often a long, tortuous trail between the original thought of merging agencies and the final decision to act. The idea may spring from staff, administrator, board, community, or from outside agencies or individuals, but no matter where the idea originates, the Boards of Directors will have the final responsibility for planning and making the decisions.

Merging often means that the board members must give up their identities with and their vested interests in buildings, specific programs, and hard won or inherited places in the social welfare structure of the community. These individuals often have given much physical and emotional energy to their jobs, and they may have a personal investment and attachment to a particular agency. Board members of agencies considering merger may represent different social, cultural, religious, and financial segments of the community. Social rivalries of boards and supporting memberships—although often concealed—may present almost overwhelming obstacles to merger discussions, for it is not easy to suddenly cast aside long-established barriers. However, the stimulating problems and progress of a newly merged agency can and often does encourage these divergent groups to work shoulder to shoulder in the interest of improving the community's program for children.

Summary

There is a real challenge in studying the needs of a community and the programs of agencies for the purpose of determining

whether or
more ade
evident in

A merg
process of
of the age
relate to
involve m
problems
agencies
executive
communi
child wel

SOM

Perry
Executive
Family an
Pittsburg

AMONG
politics
argumen
circles fo
"To mer
perennia

In its
relates to
tion car
cluding
tional fa
one reas
clear-cu
merger
instituti
place in
cumstan
beings.
the balan
such a s
resolution
at the s
city X,
dicated
merger,
particula
At some

CHIL

whether or not a merger of such agencies will more adequately meet those needs which are evident in the field of child welfare.

A merger study committee follows the process of evaluating the liabilities and assets of the agencies and of the community as they relate to social welfare. Study and planning involve many conferences to iron out the problems which will arise, for the merging of agencies involves more than their staffs, executives, and boards: it involves the entire community and may set the course of specific child welfare programs for years to come. It

is important, therefore, that the final decision to merge or not to merge should be one which has not been arrived at hastily.

There is also a challenge in facing the problems of a newly merged agency for board members, the staff, and the executive which provides a stimulus for growth through determined and cooperative action. When this cooperative action brings to the community a program which provides its children and their parents with improved and increased services for their welfare, all will feel the rewards of a job well done.

SOME PROS AND CONS OF MERGER

Perry B. Hall

Executive Secretary
Family and Children's Service
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

The author suggests criteria for evaluating proposed mergers, outlining their relative advantages and disadvantages.

AMONG THE GENERAL public, religion and politics are favorite topics for provoking argumentative reactions. In child welfare circles for more than a decade, the question, "To merge or not to merge," has been the perennial instigator.

In its most provocative form, this question relates to the merger of the traditional function carried by a child welfare agency, including a placement program, with a traditional family service program. I suspect that one reason for the difficulty in finding a clear-cut answer to it may lie in the fact that merger means structural change in a social institution at a particular time in a particular place in relation to a particular set of circumstances and involving particular human beings. Because of the problem involved and the balance of circumstances in one situation, such a structural change may be a positive resolution for that particular circumstance; at the same time such a structural change in city X, sixty miles away, may not be indicated. Or a structural change, including merger, may be the only resolution of a particular impasse that has been reached. At some later time the necessity of using that

particular solution may not be indicated, since the constellation of forces will have been changed by the fact of the merger, and by time, or by the Grim Reaper.

Merger Compared to Marriage

One could speculate that mergers are something like marriage, with the net results dependent upon the particular individuals, their purposes in entering into the alliance, the use they make of their new relationships, and the results for the several parties over a period of time. In other words, mergers do not have inherent value or lack of value but must be judged by the results which they produce. In this field, the final measurement of results is in terms of effectiveness and adequacy of service to people. Therefore, the acid test of a particular merger must be in relation to the later result in quality and quantity of service. (The word "later" is used advisedly, since obviously a structural rearrangement of this nature and extent is costly in itself as far as the immediate merging period is concerned, i.e., for the last several months immediately preceding the decision and for at least the first

twelve to twenty-four months thereafter.) An unhappy coincidence in these same first few months after the structural change is initiated is usually a heavier staff turnover than normal. At the same time there is more demand on staff for creative committee work in regard to program development for the new situation. The compensating factor is that for many people the change and opportunity for growth constitute a challenge rather than a burden and, therefore, they rise to the situation. In any event, the net results must be evaluated five years or more after a given decision is made when there has been real opportunity to capitalize on the possibilities opened up by the structural change.

New Unit May Be More Efficient

One exception to the generalization that a merger itself does not necessarily improve the quality of service may be found in cities of 75,000 to 125,000. In many such cities separate nonsectarian family service and child-placing agencies have professional staffs of less than five people. This frequently means that one supervisory person has to be executive, public relations representative, staff supervisor, and active participant in some individual case situations. While some agencies have achieved a casework program of high quality, it places extremely heavy demands upon the factotum who must have a rare combination of skills and a rare ability to keep the juggling act in proper balance at all times. In many instances, it means that some of the supervisory functions receive less settled and thoughtful attention than would be desirable. In such a setting, a merger does make possible a professional staff of eight to ten people. Thus one person or persons have a primary assignment in staff supervision, so that the executive person does not have to spread himself so thin.

In other words, the merger structural change, by increasing the operating size of the unit, may bring the agency from a marginal size to a more effective operating size. This change, of course, in itself would not guarantee an improvement in quality of serv-

ice, but it may bring such an improvement within the range of possibility. In addition to the opportunity for a more productive supervisory investment, the larger agency may permit a greater opportunity for workers to focus their practice in areas of their particular interest and skill and, therefore, may make possible more appropriate case assignment. There also may be advantages in the greater stimulation for the individual worker in being part of a large professional group. Similarly, certain specialized resources like psychiatric consultation, psychological and medical service may be more adequately developed. The enlarged budget and staff may permit their greater integration with the program as a whole and result in greater usefulness.

Two Don't Always Live as Cheaply . . .

In almost every consideration of merger proposals there are those in the decision-making group who feel that such a change will result in "saving money." This aim is very commonly disguised but very important for certain influential individuals or groups. The fact, as far as has become visible without intensive studies of results, is that most mergers spend at least the same number of dollars or more than the parent organizations. This may be partly related to the fact that mergers in the casework field have largely occurred in the period from 1940 to 1955 when the value of the dollar was shrinking. Therefore, some mergers have actually had to operate on less purchasing power than did the separate agencies. This sometimes has meant a curtailment of service. On the surface, it is easy to see why the layman may assume that a merger would bring a saving in expenditure since certain minimum items which have to be present in every framework do not need to be multiple when various frameworks are amalgamated. The most visible example, the executive, while definitely regarded as a necessity in any framework, is not usable in multiple quantities even after mergers. Probably the largest balancing factor which compensates for such "obvious savings" is the fact that the oc-

casion of merger is usually seized upon for an up-grading of the less well-developed agency. Such up-grading frequently means an increase in staff qualifications and increased salary levels. To further complicate the matter of fore and after comparisons, it happens that very frequently the before and after statistical measurements of service are not comparable because of changes in such things as how certain kinds of service are counted. Therefore, as a truism one could say that it pays to be skeptical about proof of merger value in terms of before and after dollar or service volume statistics.

When the Partners are Reluctant

One of the obvious facts of life about many mergers is that they are arrived at with less than complete agreement about their desirability. Frequently, there are years of consideration of such change with apparent substantial differences of opinion. Then the majority decision will emerge, though it may be a majority of a small decision-making group rather than a clear democratic majority of all parties working through an open election. This frequently means that a great deal of energy has been used in argument and counter-argument and that at least some members may enter into the partnership with feelings of duress. The parallel to marriage need not be pursued in detail to make the generalization that the development of new personal relationships under duress is not the most fortunate climate and circumstance.

This contest of judgments also may lead to a very heavy investment in certain details that in reality are merely transitional. Thus, the make-up of the new board and its particular fractional composition from the predecessor agencies, general public, etc., frequently becomes the greatest single matter of concern. Of course, this can be a matter of the essence, if the predecessor boards represent different points of view seeking different ends, but in general the detail of composition of the new board is a transitional one, of importance primarily in the first few months,

but not necessarily the determinant of the results of the change.

Define Goals Before It's Legal

It seems that many mergers might get off to a better start if there were some responsible group that would attempt to define the objectives of the change, particularly in terms of the nature of the service program. One could wish in many situations that there could have been such a thoughtful re-evaluation of specific purposes after the decision to merge had been resolved. For example:

A composite committee or committees from Agencies X, Y, and Z have struggled over the question of merger for five years. The issue is finally resolved that there is to be a new agency. Then, with the contest out of the way, X, Y, and Z might take another three months for a different kind of staff work together on the goals in terms of program and service.

One reason for intensive work on these subjects at this particular stage is that the very process of merging presents an opportunity for more change in a brief period than will again be present in any similar period without another major upheaval. Rightly or wrongly, it is true that human institutions tend to resist change. Part of the strategy of a merger decision, then, is to achieve the most movement in the direction of increased effectiveness of service during the period when the organism is most available for remolding. Such work could also be invaluable in a later evaluation of the results at the operating level.

The balance of these observations will relate to certain aspects of the resulting casework program. This is a particularly sensitive spot and may substantially indicate whether the turmoil and upheaval of merging has been worth-while. These are not all of the aspects, by any means, but are illustrative of the kind that particularly need more attention when contrasted with the great amount of attention that is given to subjects like board composition.

Usually in any merger proposals there are certain obvious disadvantages of previous arrangements which the merger is expected to remedy. One of these is frequently the

confusion of the public in making use of the services, since they "can't know enough about the specializations of the agencies' programs to make appropriate choices between them." Obviously the merger of the various organizational structures would usually remedy this confusion since it eliminates the problem of choices. However, a more basic criticism to the previous arrangements is the necessary transfers between separate agencies for the client who needs continuing service. Thus, one of the weighty arguments for merger is that when the services are separate the casework relationship must be broken and begun all over again in cases where clients already established with one agency need the specialized service of the other. This liability may not be eliminated with the structural change to a single agency. Some mergers seem to have resulted in a common executive, common board, and certain common central services, but are rigidly departmentalized along the same lines as the prior separate agencies. This can lead, from the operating point of view, to the same degree of interruption of client contact as when the agencies were separate entities. At the other extreme are many agencies with undifferentiated caseloads, and in between lie several agencies which have attempted to achieve a degree of flexibility in case handling based on the clients' individual needs. If one aim of structural change is to eliminate artificial interruption of service to the client because of structural arrangements, rigid departmentalization and departmental autonomy must be questioned.

Success Requires Constant Vigilance

Another very frequent aim is to speed up development of a program which has become stagnant or blocked because of a particular constellation of circumstances or personalities within one agency. The very fact of merging frequently cares for the immediate problem for the time being, but preventing its recurrence becomes a serious question to the board. Directly related to this is the selection of a staff structure which guarantees a single whole casework program

with a common emphasis and common point of view rather than a fragmentized program. The solution of this will vary with the size of the agency, but many agencies have chosen to employ a single program content leadership person in addition to the executive. This choice frequently means a single director of casework rather than co-equal departmental heads. It is an unfortunate fact that co-equal departmental heads, reporting directly to an executive and a board, may frequently find themselves in a competitive position. The board needs to be able to place responsibility in a very few staff positions which are responsible for the whole program rather than for separated parts. Regardless of structure, the problem will always remain for the board to select those individuals who can keep moving in the development of their own professional judgment and knowledge and who can keep the program moving. Unless this is done, ten years after a merger the board may again be faced with just as difficult and complex a decision in regard to an obdurate or inappropriate personality in a key spot, even though the merger was partly motivated to cure such a situation in one of the predecessor agencies.

Improved Service is not Guaranteed

In regard to the development of a casework program as a whole, it is true that many mergers inherit staff from their constituent parts that has less than the best breadth of casework practice. This inheritance may be a child placement program which had been carried out without giving fully effective service to the families involved, or family casework services carried out without appropriate individualization of children. Merger frequently permits a rapid catching up and broadening through a variety of devices—seminars, in-service training, or deliberate change of assignment to secure new educational experiences, and the day-by-day living together that results from being of a common framework.

All of these comments seem to add up to the fact that mergers per se are no guarantee of progress or regression. They are a form of

structural change which is sometimes decided upon among possible alternatives. One could speculate that as long as the voluntary field remains voluntary, it will be subject to various adaptations and developments by the decisions of those individuals who band themselves together and exercise the responsibility for these programs. Therefore, one could assume that we are apt to see further merging and some un-merging without necessarily resolving the question or proving any particular hypothesis. I am not sure that definitive research can be done on existing mergers to prove the virtue or defects of this type of change. It may well be that the most productive investment of time would be in some definitive case studies of some selected merger experience with penetrating analysis of the why and how of certain changes which came about after the structural change. Such studies could aid communities considering this matter to determine whether this kind of change would be the most usable avenue by which to secure the particular results that they envision.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

A Sensational Report on Adoption

PEARL BUCK's article, "The Shocking Scandal of Adoption," in the September issue of the *Woman's Home Companion*, does a serious disservice to children by reporting as fact what is gossip and by making gross misstatements which slander and attack, instead of providing encouragement for the provision of better services. This, despite the fact that she reiterates some of the inadequacies which need to be pointed up—inadequacies in the interpretation of the needs of children and in the interpretation of laws which overprotect parents who, in effect, abandon their children to life in an institution or boarding home.

Miss Buck has personally accomplished much by pioneering in the placement of Eurasian and Oriental children. This experience could not but have made her aware of the complex problems faced by adoption agencies. Moreover, her other professed close working relationships with agencies must certainly have led her to know that some of the conditions which she deplores are the very ones which social workers have for years been working to correct.

If one accepted the picture she paints it would be black indeed, for she questions the integrity and the intentions not only of social workers but of members of boards of directors, religious groups, and social agencies which do not employ trained social workers. It would be a simple matter if, as Miss Buck alleges, those operating programs were venal. Unfortunately, even the poor ones are well-intentioned, although they show lack of awareness of the harm they do in failing to face up to modern concepts of child care.

This brief statement might be used to examine the judgment, the honesty of reporting, and the motivation of Miss Buck. It is impossible, however, to answer all her charges in this space. Moreover, our overriding concern is with the tragic truth which she has distorted. There are hundreds of non-sectarian children's institutions in the United

University of Pittsburgh School of Social Work



PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION for men and women

*Leading to the Master of Social Work and
to the Doctor of Social Work Degrees*

A new Work-Study Program (Plan A)
is announced to parallel the regular
2-year program, (Plan B) for the
Master of Social Work

The Doctorate program emphasizes
teaching, research and administration

ADOPT

BECAUSE
Navy fam
when they
and Fam
Virginia, m
application

The Boa
Service rec
between t
who repres
lation in t
figures sh
Navy resid
Navy is fe
Any appro
past exten
background
carriers us

Children
life of Na
the city, i
to accom
and speci
needs of c
facilities,
when a n
standable
less, have
plteness

The ma
Family S
sonnel, su
of Navy
couples w

A care
cepted an
cluded in
the criter
for Navy
had 101
and 46 f
From th
study, a
homes of
of civilia
plicants

Navy—
2 secured

CHILD

States not properly equipped to serve children. In hundreds of public welfare departments case loads are so large and the staff so poorly trained that children receive only superficial services. And although a goodly number of church-related agencies have outstanding programs, many have lagged far behind in providing casework and other clinical resources for children, and their programs are untouched by modern scientific thinking. Programs under fraternal auspices, as a group, have not kept pace with current trends. An even more serious condition, ignored by Miss Buck, is that in many states the level of Aid to Dependent Children is such that hundreds of children are in institutions (or in boarding homes) solely because of the financial needs of their parents. Such conditions reflect two things: that the community is willing to pay only for what it is convinced is essential to children, and that our programs of interpretation have been inadequate.

Social workers know and have been concerned that several thousand children who are potentially adoptable are receiving institutional and boarding care because adoption facilities are not available. We know and are concerned about the fact that very few adoption agencies in the United States are equipped to place older children, although we have long agreed that adoptive placement should be the solution for a child of any age who needs and can benefit by family life.

As Mr. Field, President of the Board of the Child Welfare League of America, indicated in his answer to Miss Buck:

Of 95,260 children reported in institutions by the 1950 census, less than 3% were full orphans and 2½% legally adoptable. Over 58% returned to their reunited homes after 1.7 years (national average).

Regardless of rightness or wrongness of laws that include religious restrictions, such laws do not prevent babies from finding adoptive homes, for there are at least six Catholic families waiting for each Catholic baby, 10 Protestant families for each Protestant infant, and even more Jewish families for each Jewish baby.

Available research indicates that between 12 and 18% of older children in foster care could be placed for adoption if there were adoption facilities to untangle legal barriers and find homes. Approximately 65% of children's institutions—religious and nonsectarian—lack professional resources to ensure that the children they accept need institutional care. But to accuse them of holding children for selfish motives is grossly inaccurate. Very few are endowed; most are poorly financed. All have problems in obtaining personnel. And as for social workers, the gossip Miss Buck reports is absurd: there are 75,000 jobs waiting for 15,000 trained social workers.

When institutions lack professional resources for helping parents toward a permanent plan, children tragically remain in long-term foster care. Institutions should not be a way of life for children but a resource for those who temporarily, because of behavior problems or family situations, cannot live in an average family home. Like hospitals, they should exist for treatment. To attain this, they need money and trained personnel. Adequate care for children is not cheap. We, as citizens, must provide the necessary resources.

In short, the field of social work must recognize that we face the complex task of educating the American public as to children's needs. Using agencies as whipping boys, suggesting sweeping panaceas such as removing all children from unmarried mothers, or enacting another law, as Miss Buck suggested, will not solve this problem.

The root is lack of adequate resources which reflect lack of community understanding. None of us in social work can escape responsibility for these conditions. However, this is not a matter for adoption agencies or institutions alone, but for everyone concerned with social welfare—citizens in the community, board members and professionals alike. Good child care is not cheap. The public will pay for it if it understands why it is needed and if it truly believes that the emotional hunger of children to belong is of far greater importance than food, shelter or clothing.

Anyone writing on the subject is begging the issue if he fails to correlate this problem with the serious lack of adoption resources, and serious lack of adequate funds.

JOSEPH H. REID
Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America

ADOPTIVE PLACEMENTS AMONG SERVICE PERSONNEL

BECAUSE OF THE expressed attitude that Navy families are discriminated against when they apply to adopt a child, the Child and Family Service, Inc., of Norfolk, Virginia, made a study of Service Personnel applications for the years 1952 and 1953.

The Board and Staff of Child and Family Service recognize the need for understanding between the Agency and Navy personnel, who represent a sizable portion of the population in this community. The 1953 census figures show 237,000 civilian and 44,000 Navy residents of Norfolk. The impact of the Navy is felt the moment one enters Norfolk. Any approach to the city takes the traveler past extensive Naval installations, and in the background huge battleships and aircraft carriers usually lie at anchor.

Children play a very important part in the life of Navy families. In certain sections of the city, public schools have been enlarged to accommodate children of Navy personnel, and special consideration is given to the needs of children, such as adequate housing facilities, special care when children are ill or when a new baby is expected. It is understandable that Navy couples, who are childless, have a feeling of difference and incompleteness in their home life.

The major share of referrals to Child and Family Service have come from Navy personnel, such as Doctors, Chaplains, the Staff of Navy Relief Society, and other Navy couples who have known the Agency.

A careful review of the applications accepted and studied during the two years included in this study (1952-'53) shows that the criteria used in selection were the same for Navy and civilian couples. The Agency had 101 applications from Navy personnel and 46 from civilian residents of Norfolk. From this number, 84 were accepted for study, and 22 children were placed in the homes of Navy personnel and 14 in the homes of civilian couples. The remainder of the applicants are accounted for as follows:

Navy—24 moved away before a study was initiated, 2 secured children independently and 2 withdrew their

applications. Civilian—2 moved away, 6 secured children independently, 6 applied to other Adoption Agencies, and 6 withdrew their applications.

At the present time only 10 Navy families who have adopted children from the Child and Family Service are still living in Norfolk, and 3 of these couples have applied for the second child.

It would be almost impossible for the Agency to do a comprehensive study of the adjustment of the children placed for adoption with Navy families after ten years have elapsed.

Legal Requirements

The major restrictions and limitations posed by applications to adopt from Navy couples are the length of time involved in the study and the legal requirements affecting residency. There is always the possibility that the husband will be transferred before the study can be completed.

In some instances Navy couples informed the Agency that their application to adopt had been rejected in another port city because of the mobility of Navy families. It is true that the average adoption study, placement and supervision consumes, at least, 18 months, and the Agency's accepted practice has been to reject any application when it is certain that the couple will move from this community before the adoption can be completed. The Virginia Adoption Law requires four supervisory visits during the year following placement before the parents can proceed with adoption. If a Navy family is transferred to another port within the State, the supervisory visits are made with the co-operation of a licensed State Agency. If a couple moves to a port in another state, there are delays and complications, due to differences in State Adoption Laws. In one case, the final adoption was not completed until three years had elapsed. This case required regular correspondence between the Agency and two state departments of welfare. Reciprocity has been extended by other licensed

adoption agencies. In the event a couple is transferred before their study is completed, Child and Family Service cooperates with the agency the couple apply to for completion of the study. In turn, the Agency has completed studies, begun in other cities by licensed adoption agencies.

Factors in Selection

There are certain measurements used in the Agency's decision to study and use the home of a Navy family that are in accord with questions raised by Rita Dukette in her article in the January, 1954, CHILD WELFARE. These involve:

1. The choice by the Agency of the adoption applicant.
2. The availability of a couple who are ready for a child at the time when a child is available.
3. The methods of time saving used by the Agency.
4. The adoption applicants, and the interpersonal relations between the Agency and the couple who apply to adopt.

An adoption Agency assumes the responsibility to select a home that will provide security and happiness for each child entrusted for care. The strengths and weaknesses of each applicant, Navy or Civilian, were evaluated in the light of their potentialities for good parenthood. Adoption studies were focused on family-child relations and the applicants were evaluated as prospective parents, not as a Naval Officer and his wife.

Interviews in the office and later in the homes of the Navy couples selected showed remarkable strength, and family solidarity. The Navy wife had learned to adapt and to share, amid the uncertainties of change and separation. She had developed inner security, amid the insecurities of war or threat of war. The adoption worker frequently found a Navy couple caring for a neighbor's small child while his mother was in the hospital. Her ease and relaxation in the care of the child were observed. The Navy husband's time at home was spent in hobbies shared with his wife, such as gardening or furniture refinishing. Social life often centered in backyard barbecues, where other neighboring seamen and their families gathered. To insure

that each Navy couple who came to the Agency seeking a child to adopt understood some of the effects of frequent moves, the worker carefully evaluated with them meaning and effects of frequent separation, as well as moves from one port to another.

The timing of the adoption study was not easy, as it was often necessary to wait several months for the Navy man's return. In some instances certain pressures were exerted by the Navy couple to "speed-up" an adoption study because of the husband's pending sea duty. Naval officers are accustomed to issuing commands, and there were times when the adoption worker was sharply criticized or questioned on matters of time and procedure.

Any request for "preferential treatment," as well as over-compensation through the use of authority and pressure was examined by the worker and her supervisor. The worker focused her interviews on the applicants' early life and family relations. She moved with slowness and sureness in her evaluation of the applicants as people, irrespective of the Navy man's rank or position.

The adoption homes covered in this study showed stable marriages, founded on mutual sharing and confidence in each other. Plans for the future, to include children, were sound with no evidence of desire for a "perfect child." Physical defects were accepted realistically. One of the couples, included in this study, accepted a child with a serious eye defect.

The man's Commanding Officer, as well as others in authority, showed their interest and cooperation. Leave was arranged to coincide with readiness for showing and placing the baby. In only one case, the man received orders to transfer to another port, and it was not possible to complete the adoption placement.

An added advantage to the adoption worker was the accessibility of Naval housing, and the fact that many of the references lived in the same unit. Fifty per cent of the homes of Navy couples accepted were owned, and the family showed evidence of integration and participation in the community.

The Agency, in 1953, was asked why provision.

This study

Executive

NEWS Adoption

IN SEPTEMBER, Minister of Ontario, announced that children with disabilities included among the minority Indian children, faiths; those arrested can

The Ad this way:

A Child child for a him, fills in forwards in ice. The S month, g history, w dren's Aid

An agency decides if and happy parents in Adoption name of two inter under co child, the ment is b for placem be inquiri

The ch home has ents are a

The Agency's service charge, inaugurated in 1953, was accepted as sound. In fact, prior to the charge, some of the Navy families asked why the Agency had not made this provision.

This study was not inaugurated as a comparison between Service and Civilian couples, but to test the Agency's philosophy in the areas of choice of good parents for a child.

CHRISTINE F. ADAMS

Executive Director, *Child and Family Service, Inc., Norfolk, Virginia*

NEWS FROM THE FIELD*

Adoption Clearance Service in Ontario

IN SEPTEMBER 1954, W. H. Goodfellow, Minister of Public Welfare for the Province of Ontario, established an Adoption Clearance Service for the Province to serve children with special needs. In this category are included older children; children belonging to minority groups such as Negro, oriental or Indian children, or those of various religious faiths; those with a heart condition or an arrested case of tuberculosis.

The Adoption Clearance Service works in this way:

A Children's Aid Society which has a child for adoption, but no adoption home for him, fills in a history form for the child and forwards it to the Adoption Clearance Service. The Service publishes a Bulletin each month, giving a brief outline of the child's history, which is circularized to each Children's Aid Society throughout the province. An agency, reading this brief description, decides if this child would be comfortable and happy with certain waiting adoptive parents in their district, and contacts the Adoption Clearance Service requesting the name of the agency with the child. If the two interested agencies decide that the home under consideration is not right for this child, they inform the Service that no placement is being made, thus freeing the child for placement by another Society who might be inquiring about him.

The child is not involved until the right home has been found. The prospective parents are asked to visit the agency responsible

for the child. If they are the right parents for this child, arrangements are made for them to visit him. Several visits may be arranged before the child is taken home by his new parents.

When an agency has accepted adoptive parents but does not have the right child for them, the agency may place their history in the Bulletin. If an agency with a child for adoption reads of this home and believes it desirable for a child in their care, the procedure mentioned above is used to place the two agencies in touch with each other.

The emphasis is on the child's interests and all adoption practices are similar to an adoption being done within one agency. No names appear on the Bulletin. Children and adoptive applicants are identified by numbers. The district of the agency having the client is given.

From October, 1954, the operation of the Adoption Clearance Service shows the following statistics and proves the use and results of this Service:

Children registered by Societies with Service	107
Homes registered by Societies with the Service	90
Societies' requests for children's histories	86
Societies' requests for adoptive parents' histories	69
Children, appearing in Bulletin, placed for adoption	35
Homes appearing in Bulletin where children were placed for adoption	18
	18

"These figures prove that older children and children with special needs do not have to grow up in homes other than their own; that real parents, by adoption, are willing and eager to accept them as sons and daughters. . . . The Adoption Clearance Service offers each child a better opportunity to gain a home and parents. It establishes another real home in our community by making childless couples parents. It saves money that may be used to help other needy children."

* From a report by Laurie Charleson, Adoption Consultant, Department of Public Welfare, Toronto. Reprinted from "Concerning Families and Children," Vol. 4, No. II, The Canadian Welfare Council, Ottawa, Canada; pp. 4-6.

A BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS

Adoption by Proxy

Because of the important role of board members in determining agency policy, and because of their potential influence in promoting legislative moves to safeguard own parents, adoptive parents and the child, Mrs. Susan T. Pettiss, Assistant Director, American Branch International Social Service, wrote this statement of the problem of proxy adoptions.

A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE described the arrival of a plane from Germany among whose passengers were listed a man accompanied by "eight babies in gaily covered boxes." How could eight little German babies be brought into the United States by one man when immigration was ordinarily a tough matter? They certainly were not his children since all were about the same age. Was he going to adopt all of them? This aroused our curiosity enough to make some explorations.

We found out that a well-meaning individual, through contacts abroad, had located these babies in institutions or with unmarried mothers for families in the United States who wanted to adopt children but were frustrated by the unavailability of adoptable children in this country. The adoptions had been concluded in German Courts with the benefactor acting with a power of attorney representing the absent adoptive parents "by proxy." The eight babies were then registered with the U. S. Consul for immigration based on affidavits of support submitted by the sponsors, the adoptive parents. Visas were issued without a great delay as the German quota for U. S. immigration is not over-subscribed at present. On arrival the babies were probably shipped in their gaily covered boxes to their new parents like prize packages.

"Proxy adoption" is a new term to add to social work jargon and is a growing practice. It describes the adoption of a child in one country by parents residing in another country who were represented in court by proxy. In reality it means finalizing a legal parent-child relationship sight-unseen.

Unfortunately the incident above is not an isolated one. A sectarian children's institution in Germany recently bragged about their placement of 258 children with Ameri-

can families through proxy adoptions. A well-known fraternal organization, not recognized to participate in the Orphans Program under the Refugee Relief Act and with no child welfare staff, is actively engaged in making arrangements for placement of Greek children through distribution of pictures to eager adoptive families, and then arranging immigration under the Refugee Relief Act Orphans Section after the adoption is concluded abroad by proxy. If a child is adopted abroad it is possible for a visa to be issued for U. S. Immigration under this legislation without the "endorsement" of an authorized child welfare agency. This seems to be an abuse of the provision of this law which was intended to assist members of the U. S. armed forces and civilians living abroad in adopting foreign children while there.

Current Legislation Has Safeguards

Social welfare leaders have worked diligently for legislative recognition of the safeguards Americans are accustomed to receiving through adoption practices in this country. The Refugee Relief Act's Orphan Section which permits the immigration of four-thousand orphans for adoption either abroad or in this country does provide these safeguards. With the help of social agencies children can come into the United States for adoption in the states and communities where they will reside. It is true that these accepted procedures do sometimes thwart the self-styled benefactors in their desire to play the role of dispenser of babies to their constituent families.

There are both social and legal reasons why "proxy adoption" is undesirable. Based on the concept that adoption is a social institution established to integrate a child as a permanent part of a family, it is accepted that it should be entered into only with due consideration of all factors involved. The termination of parental rights is a serious matter which should not be undertaken lightly as it is irrevocable in most instances. A great number of children given for adop-

tion are illegitimate and the unmarried mother deserves an opportunity to make her decision about her child's future without pressure and with help in being comfortable about her decision once it is made. As the adopted child's whole future depends on the family with which it is placed, the greatest perception and skill are needed to evaluate it as the best possible home and family for this child. Children cannot make this determination of their own future so that it must be lodged with responsible and qualified persons. The parents need certain protection, too.

The risks involved in an intercountry adoption can be greater than those where a child is placed with a family of his own cultural background, language and mores. It is more than ever important, therefore, that there be a "living together period" before the legal adoption decree is finalized. Pictures and correspondence, or even a short acquaintance, are not enough. Proxy adoption eliminates the possibility of this period to become intimately acquainted as the legal relationship is established *de facto* before the child arrives in the home.

Adoption is a relationship confirmed and recognized by law. The determination as to whether this legal bond should be established is made by a court on the basis of the social evidence presented. Once an adoption decree is granted it is considered irrevocable, unless annulled by due process of law. For purpose of U. S. immigration, the United States Government recognizes an adoption if it is in accordance with the laws of the country where it was granted. This is somewhat at variance with another policy of our government, however; "proxy marriage" is not accepted as a basis for issuance of an immigration visa. There is some question whether a "proxy adoption" is considered legal in United States courts. The Supreme Court in New Jersey held in one case that a "proxy adoption" did not establish the right of inheritance.

It is relatively easy for lawyers, friends and organizations to make arrangements to conclude proxy adoptions of foreign children

for American families because in countries like Korea, Japan and Germany, many illegitimate children of American servicemen are unwanted. In Greece and Italy there are many orphaned and abandoned children in institutions for whom an adoption by an American family sounds like a wonderful opportunity. It is possible for organizations like the one located on the West Coast to engage in placement of Korean babies, for an Austrian lawyer to advertise in United States newspapers for adoptive homes for Austrian babies, for a Japanese children's home to settle their babies long distance by proxy.

As the Kefauver hearings on "black marketing" in adoptions in the United States are in progress, we cannot but wonder if the "proxy adoption" is not another practice which fits into the same category of "unprotected placements" and deserves the serious attention of social workers, lawyers, government officials. It is important that unsuspecting families be aware of all its implications. It is urgent that the U. S. consuls and immigration officials discourage individuals, seeking their advice, from this method of legalizing a relationship, even though the government gives preferential status for immigration to adopted children. It is essential that state and federal laws be amended to eliminate recognition of "proxy adoption" in this sense. Most of all it behooves social agencies to make every effort to extend their services to families wanting to adopt foreign children so that they do not resort to this unorthodox and unsound way to adopt a child.

PRINCIPAL WANTED

Egerton Home, girls' orphanage under Protestant auspices needs administrator. Room and board provided in Home. State age, religion, educational attainments, welfare training and experience in administration; also salary expected. Appointment effective as of January, 1956. Address reply to Mr. Maurice F. Rodgers, 841 W. University Parkway, Baltimore 10, Maryland.

Record Exhibit On Intake Now Available

The 1955 Case Record Exhibit activity differed somewhat from traditional practice. In some regions the Committees continued to study criteria, while in others case records were selected in conjunction with work on criteria. There was enthusiasm over the country for limiting the selection of records to the study of intake practice. Nearly 100 people participated directly in the Regional Committees through attendance at meetings and reading of records, while uncounted additional people participated within our member agencies. The 71 records submitted by 45 member agencies from 24 states included records on the following subjects:

Adoption	20 records
Day Care	6
Foster Home Care	14
Homemaker Service	1
Institutional Care	5
Own Home	11
Protective Services	10
Unmarried Mother	4

Twenty-one from this group were selected for the Permanent Library on July 15 following the Committee's reading and evaluation of those submitted. Some additional ones are being considered.

At the Case Record Committee luncheon at the National Conference of Social Work in June, a number of suggestions were made to facilitate future activity. The National Committee will be considering these suggestions which include rethinking the purpose of the Exhibit. Finally the Committee will consider a plan for completing the work on Criteria which it is hoped will provide a helpful working document to member agencies in evaluating their own records.

The Exhibit is available free of charge except for expressage on request to member and provisional agencies, and subscribers to the League's Advisory Service. To other child care agencies, schools of social work, state conferences of social work and councils of social agencies there is a fee of \$25 for three weeks, or prorated, plus expressage.

GIVE THE UNITED WAY

Where youth is served, where children are protected, where the ill and the troubled are given help and understanding —there everyone leads a healthier, happier life.

You help provide these values for your town when you contribute to your Community Chest or United Fund—the services it provides make your community a better place in which to live.

Of the \$302,500,000 in Community Campaign Funds collected last year, \$39,705,496 or 13.1 per cent went for the care of children. Over three-fourths of the agencies in League membership receive some assistance from these funds.

United Community Campaigns for voluntary health and welfare services are now in progress all over the United States and Canada. Give your share—give gladly, the United way.



Eastern Re
February
Benjamin
Chairman:

Central Re
March 15,
Netherlan
Chairman:

New Engla
March 22
Hotel Sta
Chairman

Southern 1
April 4, 5
Hotel Bil
Chairman

Southwest
April 12,
Town Ho
Chairma

BOOK

Changing
Care As
papers p
1954. 78

Service
is, for th
developme
Care As
of the a
developme
us in th
three p
these cl
shared
whole a
and the
them.

In hi

CHILD

The George Warren Brown School of Social Work

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
St. Louis 5, Missouri

Admission in Fall or Spring Semester

Entrance in spring semester, followed by summer session, permits second - year status in the master's program next fall. A two-year graduate curriculum leading to the professional degree.

Master of Social Work

Child Welfare is one of eight fields of specialization open to the student in the second year, following a first year of generic content. Supervised field practice afforded in both public and private agencies. Scholarships or training grants usually available for the qualified applicant.

Doctor of Social Work

A post-graduate professional curriculum with a research orientation.

*Early inquiry and application is advised.
For information write to The Dean.*

CONFERENCE CALENDAR—1956

<p>Eastern Regional Conference February 16, 17, 18 Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa. <i>Chairman: Dr. Elizabeth A. Lawder, Director of Placement Services Children's Aid Society Philadelphia, Pa.</i></p>	<p>Midwest Regional Conference April 16, 17, 18 Fontenelle Hotel, Omaha, Neb. <i>Chairman: Mr. Curtis E. Coe, Executive Secretary Family and Child Service Omaha, Neb.</i></p>
<p>Central Regional Conference March 15, 16, 17 Netherlands-Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio <i>Chairman: Mr. Duane W. Christy, Executive Vice-President Children's Home of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio</i></p>	<p>Northwest Regional Conference April 19, 20, 21 Hotel Multnomah, Portland, Ore. <i>Co-Chairmen: Mrs. Stanley Jewett, Deputy, Child Welfare Division State Public Welfare Commission Portland 1, Ore.</i></p>
<p>New England Regional Conference March 22, 23, 24 Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass. <i>Chairman: Mr. Harold D. Bryant, Director of Casework Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Boston, Mass.</i></p>	<p>South Pacific Regional Conference May 3, 4, 5 Hotel Statler, Los Angeles, Cal. <i>Chairman: Miss Elizabeth V. Watson State Dept. of Social Welfare Los Angeles, Cal.</i></p>
<p>Southern Regional Conference April 4, 5, 6 Hotel Biltmore, Atlanta, Ga. <i>Chairman: Miss Mary Bruce Roberts, Superintendent Hillside Cottages Atlanta, Ga.</i></p>	<p>National Conference of Social Work May 20, 25 St. Louis, Mo. <i>Chairman: Mr. Anthony DeMarinis, Executive Dir. Family and Children's Service St. Louis, Mo.</i></p>
<p>Southwest Regional Conference April 12, 13, 14 Town House, Kansas City, Kan. <i>Chairman: Mrs. Helen F. Gant, Executive Director Family and Children's Service Kansas City, Kan.</i></p>	

BOOK NOTES

Changing Concepts in Child Care, Jewish Child Care Association of New York. Collection of four papers presented at J.C.C.A. conference, January 7, 1954. 78 pp., \$1.50.

Service to emotionally disturbed children is, for the most part, largely a post-war development in this country. The Jewish Child Care Association of New York has been one of the agencies leading the way in this development. This compilation of papers tells us in thoughtful and often moving terms of three programs in this agency that serve these children. Throughout, we are aware of shared and forceful convictions within the whole agency as to the meaning of its services and the responsibilities assumed in providing them.

In his opening paper Louis H. Sobel, the

Executive Director, provides a background of information which he believed "necessary for the proper evaluation of programs" described in the other three papers. Mr. Sobel makes the point that the needs of children coming to social agencies have changed during the last twenty years and that few, if any children today, are placed because their families have no means of support. It is the experience child caring agencies have found that many of today's children are emotionally disturbed. We might reasonably assume there were many disturbed children twenty years ago too. The changed approach is in ourselves.

Miss Evelyn Spiegel, Director of the Foster Home Department, describes how the agency has served ten emotionally disturbed children between three and eight years of

for general use by social workers engaged in teaching and in staff development. Copies of the separate units may be purchased for the nominal cost of forty cents, a plan which certainly should meet a long-felt need.

The material is drawn from a variety of settings, including public and private children's and family agencies, medical social service, and the Traveler's Aid Society. Content lends itself to discussion of family relationships and casework services. There is considerable variety in the situations presented. For example:

There is the conflict of a mother and her adolescent son, following a vacation visit, over his wish to return to the relatives in a distant community who have legal rights after rearing him; the over-anxious handling of a feeding problem in a three-and-a-half year old boy by his parents; the rigidity of a mother, guilty over her own past, in handling an adolescent daughter who is beginning to assert her independence; the adjustment of two families to the illness and death of the mother, and of a widow on Aid to Dependent Children through a five-year period which terminates with the marriage of the pregnant oldest daughter.

Only a few cases do not show children directly involved, and even these, in their generic aspects, have implications for child welfare workers. Treatment illustrated generally involves emotional support and simple clarification with use of referral to other agencies, psychiatric and medical consultation, public health nursing and homemaker service, day care, foster home placement, and financial assistance.

The problem in the use of these cases in teaching seems to me to lie in the extensive use of summarization, which serves conveniently to reduce length, but also leads to loss of detail without which it is difficult to make process clear to beginners and workers without formal professional training. For example, in "Bronson," there is excellent diagnostic material from which the parent-child relationship can be discussed, but insufficiently detailed description of the development of the casework relationship with the parents to evaluate why the worker reports after fifteen months that she has failed in her goals of involving the mother in treatment of her own problems and of helping the

father seek vocational rehabilitation. Certain other cases, such as "Teller" and "Brown," do show method clearly enough for good group discussion. The latter, an intake study involving the efforts of a public child welfare division to work with the parents of two children left in a shelter by the seriously disturbed mother, would seem particularly appropriate for in-service training because of the common problems presented in cooperative relationships between a variety of agencies, the father's failure to report income, and the mother's inability to use psychiatric referral.

Perhaps increasing use of summarization in practice means learning to use new teaching methods to bridge the gaps that are left for beginners. Speculating about what took place or even acting out the scene may serve to make some of the more extensively summarized records usable in the hands of a skilled teacher.

AASE GEORGE

Associate Professor, Department of Social Work,
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

Introduction to Social Welfare. Walter A. Friedlander. Prentice-Hall, N.Y. 1955. 683 pp. \$6.75

The author is Associate Professor of Social Welfare, University of California. He states the book is addressed to ". . . (1) those citizens who wish to serve as volunteers or board members in the field of health, education or social welfare; (2) those who are looking forward to, or are employed in, positions in the fields of public assistance, social insurance, recreation, group work, public employment services—plus those in correctional, institutional, probation, and parole services, or related activities for which graduate professional training is not always required; (3) and those who plan to take up, or are engaged in, studies of graduate social work, or who are working in responsible positions and want to inform themselves through this survey of the development, the basic ideas, and the present system of social welfare."

age in a project combining foster home care and psychiatric treatment. As would be expected, these specialized foster homes have many of the same characteristics as do all good foster homes. They are warm and natural in their relationships within the family; they have the same capacity to enjoy children and they have compassion for unhappy children. However, as Miss Spiegel is careful to point out, there are differences "in the fact that the foster parents . . . possess a greater tolerance for extremely deviant and bizarre behavior and are challenged by the opportunity to help these children." Agency psychiatrists carry an important role in the program, both as consultants and in the giving of intensive psychiatric treatment to the children.

In addition to the regular board rate paid foster families, a subsidy is being paid for these special services. Moreover, the agency subsidizes the employment of some household help in these foster homes.

In his paper on "Dynamics of Specialization in Helping the Retarded Child in Placement," Bernard Scher, Director of Edenwald School for Boys, writes of the pioneering work of this school providing a placement and treatment service to sixty retarded and emotionally disturbed children. He has witnessed the reversal of the "downward spiral," in which the retarded child so often becomes more infantile, to an upward spiral that enables the child to learn to live with his handicap and to use his strengths to best advantage. Mr. Scher reminds us that "retarded children who are too disturbed to remain in their homes or the community can be helped to grow to the point where they can go back to both . . . [and] can be helped to self-maintenance and self-esteem."

Jacob Hechler, Director of the Pleasantville Cottage School, completes this fine list of agency papers as he traces the development of Pleasantville, originally conceived as a substitute home for children, to its present residential treatment service "to bring about improvement in personality and in family relations." Today the child remains at the institution only so long as is necessary to accomplish this therapeutic end.

For those who are struggling with the problem of initiating and developing residential treatment services, there may be both reassurance and concern to read that "the concept of the treatment home varies in meaning and that many different paths of thinking and purpose are being followed." Mr. Hechler says that "there is no therapeutic or practical differentiating between this kind of service as against hospital treatment on one end and a former type of custodial care on the other. There is, as yet, no uniformity of understanding as to the kind and depth of psychic disturbance that institutions of this type should serve and no established philosophy or program of treatment." He raises the basic problem: "In what way, to what degree and to what extent —may an environment per se be made over to provide therapy in a direct form," contrasting the concept of milieu therapy developed by Bettelheim in *Love Is Not Enough*, with Eva Burmeister's description of the program at Lakeside in, *Forty-five In The Family*.

We are indebted to the Association and to Mr. Hechler for stating so clearly the established philosophy and program of one of our outstanding children's agencies. In all these papers we are constantly brought face to face with the separation and placement aspects of the treatment services described. It is essential that these aspects be recognized, worked with and emphasized.

"Changing Concepts in Child Care" is an enlightening and stimulating report of the professional development of services to children in one agency and, as such, has great value for the entire social service field.

C. ROLLIN ZANE

Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut,
Hartford, Conn.

Case Records for Study and Teaching, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1954 (Mimeo.), \$2.85.

This spiral-bound volume contains six pieces of case material involving short-contact and referral service, three intake studies, and seven longer treatment cases prepared

CLASSIFIED PERSONNEL OPENINGS

Classified personnel advertisements are inserted at the rate of 10 cents per word; boxed ads at \$6.50 per inch; minimum insertion, \$2.50. Deadline for acceptance or cancellation is eighth of month prior to month of publication. Ads listing box numbers or otherwise not identifying the agency are accepted only when accompanied by statement that person presently holding the job knows that the ad is being placed.

CHILD WELFARE WORKERS for various Arizona communities. Immediate openings in Florence, Globe, Phoenix, Tucson, and Yuma. Appointment may be made above minimum of \$273-\$316 range. One year of graduate training in casework required. Contact Merit System Supervisor, State Office Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

PHOENIX, ARIZONA—Casework vacancies for experienced graduate workers in family agency. Salary \$3600-\$5500. Appointment salary dependent upon qualifications. Write Mrs. Ella H. Perkins, Executive Director, Family Service of Phoenix, 702 E. Adams St., Phoenix, Ariz.

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR—Man or woman with Master's degree in group work or casework and also experience in working with children. Small progressive children's institution, CWLA member. Casework and group work program and psychiatric consultation. Starting salary: \$5100-\$5400, dependent on qualifications. Write Maxine Elliott, Director, Hathaway Home for Children, 840 North Ave. 66, Los Angeles 42, Cal.

CASEWORKER, opening for professionally trained caseworker in family and children's agency. Staff of 10. Qualified supervision and psychiatric consultation. Salary to \$4980. Catholic Social Service, Thayer Bldg., 577 14th St., Oakland 12, Calif.

CASEWORKER, Catholic, professionally trained for progressive family & child welfare agency. 20 miles south of San Francisco. Salary \$3780-\$4704, can appoint at \$4704. Social Security & retirement benefits. 1 month vacation. Good supervision and psychiatric consultation. Apply Catholic Social Service, 112 N. San Mateo Dr., San Mateo, Calif.

DISTRICT CHILD WELFARE CONSULTANT, State Child Welfare Division. Minimum Requirements, two years' graduate social work training and three years' experience. Salary range \$344-\$439. Travel expense allowed. Consultant gives supervision and consultation on child welfare matters in assigned district. Complete details by writing Marie C. Smith, Director, Child Welfare Division, 322 Capitol Annex, Denver, Col.

CHILD WELFARE WORKER in local public welfare department to carry casework services and placement in subsidized foster homes of children referred to department and to work with unmarried mothers. Requirements: Master's degree social work school, or one year in school of social work plus one year social work experience. Salary \$3588-\$4212. Complete details by writing to Director of Personnel, Municipal Bldg., Hartford, Conn.

CASEWORKERS—Litchfield County Office—Challenging opportunity in District Office adding family service to child placing services. Work with community involved as well as casework with parents and children. Worker for Hartford Office offering foster home placement and unmarried mother service. Master's degree in social work, present salary \$3200-\$4700 depending on experience. Beginning January 1956, \$3800-\$5300. Private, nonsectarian, multiple-function agency. Small caseloads, excellent supervision, student training program, psychiatric consultation. C. Rollin Zane, Executive Director, Children's Services of Connecticut, 1680 Albany Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.

CASEWORKER, preferable psychiatric, to work with small group of foster parents and take part in frequent group discussion led by psychiatrist, Yale Child Study Center. Opportunity for research, salary about \$4000. Immediate opening.

CASEWORKER. Opening in family-children's service agency for qualified caseworker. Salary range comparable with good agency practice. Information upon inquiry. For further information write Director, Catholic Social Service Bureau, 478 Orange St., New Haven 2, Conn.

CASEWORKER—Master's in social work, for adoption work in multiple-service agency. Salary range being revised, can appoint at \$4800 if experience warrants. Psychiatric consultation. Social Security, retirement. Eleanor Sheldon, Family & Children's Services, 79 Worth St., Stamford, Conn.

CASEWORKERS (2): Openings in private child care agency (boarding care department). Placement and supervision of children in temporary foster homes, work with own families and foster home studies. Excellent personnel practices and supervision; psychiatric consultation. Requirements: Master's Degree Social Work School and experience in child welfare. Salary from \$3500 commensurate with experience. Miss Elizabeth S. Townsend, Executive Director, 1310 Delaware Ave., Wilmington 6, Del.

CASEWORKER with graduate training for rapidly developing placement agency. Excellent supervision. Limited caseloads. Good personnel practices. Write Mrs. Irene Shapaker, Children's Services, 46 E. Broad St., Savannah, Ga.

CASEWORKER—Opening for professionally trained person with or without experience, in agency offering homemaker service and counseling to families and individuals. High professional standards; good supervision; excellent personnel standards. Salary for beginning worker \$4500; for others, on basis of experience. Write Miss Marguerite M. Munro, Family Service of Savannah, 109 W. Jones St., Savannah, Ga.

CASEWORKERS: Progressive church agency, middle-west. Salary \$3400-\$5400. Caseload approximately 20 children. Excellent supervision. Write **Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church**, 740 Rush St., Chicago 11, Ill.

Caseworkers—desiring opportunities with church-affiliated child care agencies are invited to communicate with the **Board of Hospitals and Homes of the Methodist Church**, 740 Rush St., Chicago 11, Ill.